

REMARKS

Claims 25-47 are pending in this application. Claims 25, 31, 34, and 46 are independent claims. Claims 25, 31, and 34 are amended. Claims 46 and 47 are have been added. Claim 1-24 have been previously canceled. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicants note with appreciation that on April 30, 2008, an interview was conducted with the Examiner. The rejections of claims 25-47 under §103 were discussed. Additionally, proposed amendments were discussed. The Examiner indicated that the claims, as they are amended in this Response, would overcome the present art rejection.

Claim Rejections

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – *Ito et al*

Claims 25-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,160,778 (“Ito et al.”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 25 been amended in accordance with the Examiner’s comments from the interview of April 30, 2008. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit Ito fails to teach or suggest each of the limitations in amended claim 25.

Consequently, the Ito reference is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 25 as is required to support a rejection under §103.

Further, amended claims 31, 34 and 46 contain limitations similar to those of claim 25. Accordingly, at least in view of their similarity to claim 25, the Ito reference is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to any of claims 31, 34 and 46 as is required to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103,.

Additionally, claims 26-30, 37, 38 and 43 depend from claim 25; claims 32, 33, 39, 40 and 44 depend from claim 31; and claims 35, 36, 41, 42 and 45 depend from claim 34; and claim 47 depends from claim 46. Accordingly, at least in view of their dependency from claims 25, 31, 34, and 46, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to any of claims 26-30, 32, 33, 35-45, or 47 as is required to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 25-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
HARNES, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JHA
GDY/JHA: tlt